THE ANATOMY OF

Dr. *Gauden's* Idolized *Non-sence* and *Blasphemy*, IN HIS Pretended *Analysis*, or *setting forth* the true Sense OF THE

COVENANT;

That is to say,

Of that *SACRED COVENANT* taken by the *Parliament*, the *Commissioners* of *Scotland*, and the *Assembly*, *September* 11. 1643.

Cyprian ad Cornelium.

Atque hæc Frater, vere est dementia, non cogitare, nec scire, quod mendacia non diu fallant.

LONDON:
Printed in the Year MDCLX.

Case
C
657
.326

60-2516
GN

THE ANATOMY OF Dr. *Gauden's* idolized *Non-ſence* and *Blaſphemy*, IN His pretended *Analyſis* of the *Covenant*.

FOr the the better underſtanding of this buſineſs, the Readers both of that Book and this, muſt know, That the late *Long Parliament*, (I mean, both the honourable Houſes) drew up, took, and ordered others to take, two ſeveral *Covenants*, in one year. The firſt was taken in or about the beginning of *June* 1643. entituled, *The Vow and Covenant appointed by the Lords and Commons aſſembled in Parliament, to be taken by every man, in the Cities of* London, Weſtminſter, *and the Suburbs and Liberties thereof, and throughout the whole Kingdom.* The other was that *Solemn League and Covenant*, which the ſame *Parliament*, the *Commiſſioners* of the Kingdom and Church of *Scotland*, and the *Aſſembly of Divines*, took at *Weſtminſter*, the 11 day of *September*, in the ſame year, and appointed it to be taken by both Kingdoms.

See more of this neer the end of this Book.

Now, you are to take notice, that it is onely the *laſt* (the far better of the two) which this affected Maſter of Words, (and of little elſe, for ought appears by this and ſundry other things by him written †) hath *oppoſed*, inſtead of *explaining*; and, againſt which, he hath lately thrown out among his deluded Admirers, a new flatulent Piece (as *Jupiter* did his Log among the Frogs) which he calleth, *Analyſis*, or, *The looſing of St.* Peters *bands, ſetting forth the true ſenſe* (if you will believe him) *and ſolution* (that is, the *diſſolution*, if he can effect it) *of the Covenant, ſo far as it relates to the Government of the Church by Epiſcopacy.* To which Title of his, (as an inlet to his Diſcourſe, as well as warrantie for the *Title*) he hath ſubjoyned part of *Acts* 16. 26. *The*

† Witneſs his *tears, ſighs*, &c. *of the Church of* England. His *Sermon at Pauls*, as it was printed, *&c.*

foundations of the priſon were ſhaken, the doors opened, and every ones bands were looſed. Thus he rehearſeth that Text.

Before I fall to unripping of that *Paſquil it ſelf*, I muſt a little conſider the *Title* of it, in which he preſenteth us with a piece of his *Non-ſenſe*; if not *Blaſphemy*, to boot. *Non ſenſe*, firſt: For, what *Oedipus* can unriddle thoſe firſt words in it, (*The looſing of St.* Peter's *bands*) ſo as (according to his undertaking) to make *ſenſe* of them? Was St. *Peter* bound in this *Covenant?* Or, did he impoſe it upon others? If neither, why doth this Wordy Doctor call his Book, *The looſing of St.* Peter's *bands?* If this be not his meaning, what ſenſe can there be of that his vapouring flouriſh?

And why St. *Peter*'s bands? Oh, he hath a Text for it, *Act.* 16.26. as ye ſaw but now. But, in alledging it, he will rather pare off part of Gods own words, (which run thus, *The foundations of the priſon were ſhaken, and immediately all the doors were opened*, &c.) than not carry on his own affected Cadencies in his ſtile. But this is but one of his Peccadillo's.

Now, what intendeth he, by this *looſing* of St. *Peter*'s *bands*; and by that, in *Acts* 16.26? He tells you: *The ſetting forth the true ſenſe and ſolution of the Covenant*, &c. by *John Gauden*, D. D. Very good. It is then *John Gauden* that hath *looſed St.* Peter's *bands*, that hath *ſhaken the foundations of the priſon, opened all the doors, and looſed every ones bands* that were in it. If this be not *Blaſphemy*, (as he applies it) then, O moſt glorious *John!* Why do not his zealous Adorers ſay of him, as ſometimes the *Barbarians* of *Paul*, That *he is a God?* Why ſend they not for one of the Prieſts of *Jupiter* (I will not ſay, ſome old, high *Epiſcopalian*) to *bring Oxen and Garlands, to ſacrifice unto him, with the people?*

However, ~~*dic ſodes*~~, Doctor. Was it St. *Peter* indeed, that was in Priſon? Were they *his bands* that you have *looſed?* I verily were they, by your telling. And therefore, though the Text be far from ſaying any ſuch matter, yet if Doctor *John Gauden* ſay it, it muſt be believed without gain-ſaying, though he prove it not. Nevertheleſs, if we may be ſo bold, as to conſult the verſe next going before, we
Act. 16.25. might (if we durſt) tell him, that we find onely *Paul* and *Silas*; but no St. *Peter* there: unleſs he will ſay (which he may as well ſay, as what he doth; for, it is not his manner to prove ought) that *Paul* and *Silas* is Greek for St. *Peter*; and St. *Peter* is Engliſh for *Paul* and *Silas*; and ſo, they are all one.

But perhaps St. *Peter* (in this mans intention) denotes his Succeſſors at *Rome*; with whom this charitable Doctor profeſſeth (elſewhere *) a deſire to hold not onely *all inward, but all actual Communion in all Doctrines and Duties of Faith and Worſhip agreeable to the Word of God*, (as if that Romiſh Crew performed any ſuch Duties, without ſo much mixture

* In his *tears, ſighs, &c. of the Church of England.* Pag. 314.

mixture of will-worſhip and ſuperſtition, as hath not, from the ſame Word of God, procured a ſtrait charge to all Gods people, to *come out of her*, not ſo much in regard of place, as *Communion*, which is doomed as a *partaking of her ſins.*) And, if this be his meaning, his Charity hath ſo far tranſported him, as to looſen what God hath laid on thoſe pretended Succeſſors, and all their *Locuſts*; by upholding *Communion* with *Popery*, which the *Covenant* engageth all to *extirpate*. If this be his meaning, let him ſpeak out. Rev. 18, 4.

If he mean otherwiſe, he is groſly miſtaken. Indeed, we find St. *Peter* to be caſt into *Priſon* at *Hieruſalem*, by *Herod*, where he had *chains put upon his hands*, Act. 12. which, by means of the inceſſant *prayers of the Church to God for him*, an *Angel* went and *unlooſed*; opened the priſon doors, and ſo brought him out. But, good Sir, were you that *Angel*? If ſo, let your *Title* ſtand. I will have no further difference with you about it.

But, *Paul* and *Silas*, whoſe *impriſonment* is mentioned in your alledged Text, *Act.* 16. were impriſoned at *Philippi*, far diſtant from St. *Peters* priſon. And even there, we read of no *bands* upon them, but onely that their *feet were made faſt in the ſtocks*. And, for ought appears, they were not out of the ſtocks, when *the bands of every one* elſe were *looſed*: but they continued therein, till the *Jaylor* himſelf came in, and took them thence. But, be that ſo, or ſo; we will not contend about it.

Whoſe *bands* then were *looſed*? The bands of the *Jayl birds*, who had been caſt in before: namely, *Thieves*, and perhaps *Murderers*, and other *Rogues* and *Malefactors*: for they are the uſual Gueſts in ſuch places. Now, if any ſuch have taken *the Solemn League and Covenant*, and are thereupon troubled in Conſcience, ſo as not to dare to ſet up the old *Hierarchy* again, with ſome ſmall refining, let them repair to Dr. *John* to *looſe* them of that *band*; and he will do it. But, for the greater encouragement of ſuch men and others that are for that Lordly Epiſcopacy, and would gladly read his Book, to be ſatisfied in Conſcience therein, I could wiſh the *Title* might be altered, and put into the words of *Martin Mar-prelate*, in anſwer to Dr. *J. Bridges* that had pleaded for ſuch Biſhops and their Trinkets; (only changeing the Name) that the *Title* of the Book might run thus:

O read Dr. John Gauden, *for it is a worthy Work.*

Which, how *worthy* it is, we ſhall now further enquire, by looking into the Book it ſelf. In proſecution whereof, I ſhall induſtriouſly avoid the waſte of ſo much time, and paper, as would be taken only up in purſuing all his out-leaps and extravagancies; and uſe all poſſible brevity

brevity in opening some of the principal onely, for the undeceiving of such as dote upon this μεγας, of *great one*, as if he were *the great power of God.*

Acts 8. 10.

The main scope of my present endeavour is this: namely, to make it manifest, that this Doctor, under pretence of *giving that sober sense of the Covenant, whereof he believeth it to be capable before God, before all good Christians, and in a mans own well-informed Conscience*, (which he promiseth, pag. 3,4. and to do it with *freedom from passion and prejudice* (pag. 5.) he directly laboureth to decry, vilifie, and blaspheme the *Covenant* it self, and to make it odious, as that which was sinfully taken at first, and of necessity to be cast off, and abhorred by all that have entred into it. For more distinct proceeding therein, I shall endeavour to make out these four Propositions.

1. *That he himself doth admit the Covenant, to be, in some sense, lawful and good.*

2. *That, therein, all sober Christians, who understand themselves, agree with him.*

3. *That all this notwithstanding, he endeavours to vilifie, make odious, and to destroy the Covenant it self.*

4. *That, maugre all his calumnies, and malicious aspersions, the Covenant, (even as to the point of extirpating that hierarchical Prelacy lately laid aside,) is to be constantly and conscientiously observed and kept, in the right sense thereof, by all that have taken it, as they will avoid destruction here, and damnation hereafter.*

I. PROPOSITION.

That the Doctor himself doth admit the Covenant to be, in some sense, lawful and good.

1. HIs own words before alledged (where he saith he *hath endeavoured to give that sober sense of the Covenant, whereof he believeth it to be only capable before God, before all good Christians, and in a mans own well-informed Conscience*) is evidence enough (against him, at least,) *that the Covenant is lawful and good.* How else could he give a *sober sense* of it, which he believes would hold water, *before God, all good men, and a well informed Conscience?*

2. He tells us (pag. 14.) *that he will look upon the Covenant (with the best aspect, considered in Conscience) in the softest sense that can be made of it*; namely, *as a voluntary Vow, or Religious Bond, by some spontaneously taken*, in order to declare their *sense of duty to God, the King,*

the

the Church, their Country, and the reformed Religion, to make themselves more strictly sensible of the sacred and civil obligations respectively due to them, that so they might be more ready to discharge them in their places and callings, &c. ——— (And is not this *lawful*, and *good?*) He after addeth, that *he believeth that very few took it in any sense, against Primitive, Reformed, and Regular Episcopacy, so reduced to an efficacious conjunction with Presbytery, as the most reverend Primate of* Armagh *proposed in his Reduction of Episcopacy.* Now, if such a *Reduction* be necessary, the *Covenant* in this sense cannot be *unlawful*, but *good.*

3. In pag. the 20. he saith, *The most strict and severe Covenanter cannot but be satisfied and absolved in point of Conscience, if first he hath and still doth, in his place and calling, seasonably advise, humbly petition, and lawfully endeavour to reform what is truely amiss in the Church-Government by Bishops. Secondly, If he use the like means to restore and preserve what he finds good and useful in Episcopacy.* —— They then that do not thus, cannot be *satisfied or absolved in point of Conscience:* therefore to do this, by vertue of the *Covenant*, is *lawful and good.*

4. In his voluminous Book of *Tears and Sighs*, &c. pag. 448. he reckons up sundry *evils, defects and dangers incident to Episcopacy*, as namely, *pride, ambition, secular height, and idle pomp, a supercilious deficiency and Lordly Tyrannizing over other Ministers, and the flocks of Christ under their inspection; arrogating a power to do all things imperiously, and alone, without any regard either to that charitable satisfaction which was antiently given to Christian people; or, to that fraternal Counsel and concurrence which might and ought in reason to be had, from learned and grave Presbyters*, &c. ——— Is not all this enough to prove from his own Pen, That such a *Covenant, for extirpating such an Episcopacy, is lawfully and good?*

Indeed, he would (in the same breath) fain extenuate this his unripping of the late Hierarchy, by saying, *that this ariseth not from the function or imployment, but from the persons of Bishops*, (which he brings in, by a *parenthesis:*) but, when he had undertaken to enumerate the evils, defects and dangers *incident to Episcopacy* it self, of late in use, How can these be separated from that *Function?* And if they arise *from the persons of Bishops*; do they not arise from the *imployment* of *Episcopacy?* for, how else could they be *incident to Episcopacy?* That parenthesis then, is but a piece of contradictory non-sense, which can no way infringe the inference I have here made of it, to confirm, from the Author himself, the first point here undertaken.

II. PRO-

II. PROPSITION.

Herein all sober Christians who understand themselves, agree with him.

* Pag. 3. HE is pleased indeed, (pag. 6.) from Sir *L.B.* (at whose *motion* *, he wrote and published that pamphlet) to say, that Sir *L. B.* (a fit Patron for such a Proctor) told him, *that many sober and honest men, are by their once taking the Covenant, so scared from all complyings with any Church-government, under any name of Bishops, or notion of Episcopacy, never so reformed and regulated; that they fear, by looking back to the Primitive, Catholique, and Universal Government of this, and all other antient Churches, to be turned into pillars of Apostacy, as Lots wife was, into a pillar of Salt.*

If the Knight told him so, in these words, we must needs admire the *metamorphosis* of a *Cutler* turned Knight, that hath arrived already at such *heards of good words, and flocks of figures:* and, that he, who heretofore took the *Covenant*, and pretended to be a zealous propugner of it, and of all that had taken it, should now, (in hope to get into some place to help maintain his *Knighthood*) leave all those of his former party, and run over to such a flashy Advocate for *Episcopacy*, and a mortal enemy to all *Covenanters*, to assoyle the doubts of *sober honest men* that had entred into that Covenant.

But, if that Knight did so inform him, it is be doubted, whether he did it, for want of ignorance, or of *stedfastness in that Covenant* of God, and out of a desire of procuring (by that his story to the Doctor, and his *motion* for his *resolution* of this business, *in point of Conscience*) some plausible Apology for his own intended *Apostacy*. However he did it, let that K. take this to him as the forerunner of that reward which he must expect from that God whose Covenant he hath thus occasioned to be despised. That all the reproaches and blasphemies that are or shall be belched out against the Covenant, (occasioned by reading that scurrilous Satyre of Dr. *John Gauden*) will one day be put to the account of Sir *L. B.* as the principal occasion of it, and instigator to it; if God give him not timely repentance, and stop the current of those railing *Shimei's*, who are glad of this opportunity to set *their mouths against heaven*, and to let *their tongues walk through the earth* (b).

b Psa 73. 9.

But, to leave this digression. I come to make good the second point; which I enlarge thus: *That the admitting of some Church-governours, under the name of Bishops, reformed and regulated according to the Primitive Catholique and Apostolique Institution, for the Government of this Church, is not against, but very consistent with, and agreeable to the late*

late Solemn League and Covenant, and the true intention of it, allowable by God and all good men that rightly understand themselves and the Covenant. And, thus far, *they concur with the Doctor.*

To make this out briefly, take notice,

1. That the *Covenant*, *Art.* 2. as to this point, runs thus: *That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly (through the grace of God) endeavour the extirpation of Popery and Prelacy (that is, Church government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons and all other Ecclesiastical Officers depending on that Hierarchy,) Superstition, Heresie, Schism, Prophaness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound Doctrine and the power of godliness; lest we partake in other mens sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and, that the Lord may be one, and his name one in the three Kingdoms.*

This expresly relates to the *Prelacy* or *Episcopacy* then in being and use in *England* (which was far from *Apostolique* and *Primitive*, as this Doctor, in his words before cited out of his Book of *Tears*, &c. hath clearely confessed:) and to the extirpating of whatsoever in it savoured of *Superstition, Tyranny, Schism, Prophaness, Sinfulness*, or was otherwise *contrary to sound Doctrine, or the power of godliness.* If there be any other *Episcopacy*, truly *Apostolique* and *Primitive*, free from all these evils, and *agreeable to sound Doctrine, and the power of godliness*, It is so far from the sense and intention of this Covenant, to *extirpate* it, that it plainly includes rather a binding of all Covenanters to endeavour, by all lawful and fit ways and means, to procure it.

2. That herein, by the Doctors own allegations, *all sober honest men that rightly understand themselves, and the true meaning of the Covenant, concur with him.*

Himself saith, (pag. 22.) that the *Covenant is no way in Conscience to be stretched against a right and regular Episcopacy, no more than Physique given to cure a disease, should like unmortified Quick silver, be applyed to kill the man.* And this, he *knows, was the sense of the most learned men in the Assembly.* And this, (he saith, pag. 23.) *He hath often heard Mr.* Marshal *, *and others affirm (who had a great hand in penning and promoting the Covenant) and they owned it to some Foraign Divines, That the Covenant was levelled at the* (Despoticum, Tyrannicum regimen) *mis-government, not the Government by Episcopacy.*

* This may put him in mind, that hereupon, himself took the Covenant, which he now so much vilifieth.

To which, he addes, *This is at present, the sense and hopes of the most learned and godly Presbyterians, whom I have lately spoken with in* London *and elsewhere*, &c. And a little after, he *beseecheth God, that by his Majesties piety and wisdom, (all those materials which were good in that ancient, noble, and venerable fabrick of Episcopacy) may be speedily and resolutely setled in its best constitution: wherein, to take counsel, is Kingly, and Christian.*

But whereas, he there (pag. 23.) saith, that this was also the sense *of those, who with himself, had as much right to sit among them* (that is, in the *Assembly*) *as any others, but were not permitted, either by popular faction and tumult, or by other shufflings and reasons of State; which took care to exclude or deter all the excellent Bishops of the Church, and the most able of Episcopal Divines, for fear there should have been any just plea for moderate Episcopacy, against the then Magistry of Presbytery:* To this I must give this Answer:

1. That I willingly accept of that part of this speech, that this (to wit, what was before by him spoken, and by me alleged, touching the right *Episcopacy*) was the sense of himself, and of those that by his telling, *had right to sit in the Assembly*, to make out my present assertion of the *concurrence* of able men herein.

2. That which he here affirmeth either of himself, or any others having *right to sit in the Assembly of Divines* called by *Ordinance* of both Houses of Parliament, dated *June* 12. 1643. that they *were not permitted, either by popular faction and tumult, or by other shufflings*, &c. to *sit*, &c. is a very great slander. For,

1. Touching himself, who (not now only, but heretofore) hath complained, that he having as *much right to sit* among the Divines in the *Assembly* as any others, was not permitted to sit there. If he mean that *he had as much right as any others*, who were not at all chosen to sit there, I admit what he saith, to be true. But, if he intend to insinuate that he was *chosen*, and yet not permitted to sit, this is a loud untruth; for he being then (as I remember) Parson of the *Deanry* of *Bocking* in *Essex* (which albeit it be reputed to be worth 4 or 500 *l. per an.* yet he, to his shame, and the little honour of those that imploy him, is non-resident from it, and preacheth at the *Temple*:) was not chosen to be one of the *Assembly*. For, in *Essex* were chosen Mr. *Stephen Marshal of Finchingfield*, Mr. *Obadiah Sedgwick*, then of *Cogshal*, and Mr. *Matthew Newcomen* of *Dedham*. But this Doctor was chosen neither there, nor any where else, as by the Ordinance it self is obvious to every eye that will peruse it. And had it been otherwise, he had not been permitted, (as I can tell him in his ear) to have been absent from the *Assembly*.

And why should he so much complain, and bewayle his *not being permitted to sit in that Assembly*, which he so much vilifieth, and calleth, *A sifted Sequatious Assembly* c; *a Scot-English Assembly which were as the grand Inquest, the Promoters or Apparitors to the Long Parliament* d: *Rabbies sitting in* Moses *Chair* e? And then, taking it for granted, that the *Assemby* were the *Annotators* on the Bible (which is altogether untrue) he chargeth them so, *as if they were Chaplains at once serving the Lord, their Bellies and the times, as partaking of the Table of the Lord, and the Table of Devils* f. I forbear to foul more paper with

c Tears. & c p. 212.
d Pag. 334.
e Ibid.
f Ibid pag. 334.

with the reſt of his *Billinſgate* Rhetorick beſtowed on that *Aſſembly*.

But now, mark the inference. He is angry that he, *having right*, was not permitted to ſit in that *Aſſembly*. Therefore, his anger, muſt needs be for this, that he could not be a *Sequatious Aſſembly-man*, one of the *Grand Inqueſt*, *a Promoter and Apparitor of the Long Parliament*, *a Chaplain at once ſerving the Lord, his Belly, and the times*, and *a Partaker of the Table of Devils*, as well as *of the Lord*. O what pity is it that he ſate not! Surely, I have ſo much charity for him, (if I may judge of the tree by this fruit) as to believe, and profeſs, that if the *Aſſembly* had been ſuch as he deſcribeth it, he had better *right to ſit in it*, then any that ſate there.

Indeed, his laſt mentioned expreſſion of the Aſſembly as being *Chaplains at once ſerving the Lord, their Bellies, and the Times*, aroſe from his Bilious Paſſion at the *Annotators* for not finding a knot in a Bulruſh; and that from ſome Textst, they did not brand that for *Sacrilege*, which he had done; whether thoſe Texts, condemn it, or not. But I muſt not further make an Excurſion upon this: but leave him to D. *B.* upon whom he hath beſtowed 10 whole leaves in *Folio* in that his ſcoulding *Tears*, &c. *of his Mother* g, in nothing but raving, rayling, belying the Doctor, without affording one line in a ſerious, ſolid, ſober confuting of either that Doctors *Definition* of *Sacrilege*, any Text of Scripture, or other Arguments or Reaſons for his opinion; or, to diſprove the ſame. g See p 685 &c.

But, you will ſay, what is that to me? I confeſs, this is a digreſſion, therefore I will ſay no more, but onely adviſe Dr. *John* to ſpend half the time (if he can ſpare no more) in peruſing D. *B.* his ſecond Edition of that Tract of *Sacrilege*, (which D. *J. G.* cannot but have ſeen) that he hath trifled away in rayling upon D. *B.* and, to confute that Book, if he can; becauſe, as I hear, he hath promiſed ſo to do. This, if he will once perform, like a Scholar, and a Divine; then, whereas D. *G.* hath in his *Sighs* h, &c. ſaid (moſt gravely) that D. *B.* by his *late purchaſe will give the world cauſe in after-ages, to look as narrowly to him, and his poſterity, how they thrive, as the Roman Souldiers did to the Jews Guts and Excrements, when they ſearched for the Gold which they had ſwallowed*, as *Joſephus* * *tells us*. I dare undertake, that then, if D. *G.* will either deſire to be the Groom of D. *B.* his Stool, or to be at the charge thereof, he ſhall have all that comes from him and his, without purloyning, or the leaſt diminution. h pag. 664. *De excid. Hieroſ.

2. But, as to what he ſaith of *others, having right to ſit*, that they were *not permitted, either by popular faction and tumult, or by other ſhuffings and reaſons of State, which took care to exclude or deter all the excellent Biſhops, and the moſt able of Epiſcopal Divines*, &c. is a moſt groſs and malicious *untruth*.

For, among thoſe that were choſen, and ſummoned to ſit in that

Assembly, what say you to Dr. *Richard Love*, Dr. *Raph. Brownrig* Bishop of *Exceter*; D. *Samuel Ward*, Dr. *John Harris*, Dr. *Robert Saunderson*, Mr. *Robert Cross*, *James Archbishop of Armagh*, D. *Matthias Styles*, Dr. *Featly*, Dr. *Christopher Pashly*, Dr. *John Hacket*, Dr. *Thomas Westfield* Bishop of *Bristol*, D. *Henry Hammon*, Dr. *Rich. Oldsworth*, and many moe? Where can you pick out three *Bishops*, more *excellent* for learning and piety? or, other *Episcopal Divines*, more *able?* of 122 Divines chosen to *sit*, there were 24 that never appeared. And even in the *Assembly*, some protested against the extirpation of *Primitive Episcopacy*, of which Mr. *Herbert Palmer* was one. And Dr. *Burges* was suspended from sitting there, by the *House of Commons*, for declaring and protesting against the first draught of the *Covenant*, brought into the *Assembly*, for that (among other things) there was required an extirpation of *Prelacy* indefinitely and absolutely, without either limitation, or explication.

As for those that came not, who *excluded, or deterred them?* they were all summoned, as appears by the Books of the *Assembly*. What hindred them? was it not either because they liked not the Election, or the Persons chosen to sit with them; or, that they being for the late King, durst not to sit, either for fear of molestation by the Parliament, or displeasure of the King?

For the manner of *Election*, it was no other for kind (although more Solemn and warrantable) than that antecedaneous choice, which the Lords had made of sundry Lords, Bishops and other Divines, to consult at the Deans House of *Westminster*, touching reformation in matters of Religion; at which none then boggled, but all readily joyned in it.

**Witness the Chancelor and Register of Lincoln, chosen at once to sit in Convocation in the last Kings reign: which two, a great Prelatical Doctor that knew them well, called Simeon and Levi; the Devil and his Damme: upon occasion of that their Election.*

For the *persons chosen to sit with them*, they were all of them reputed to be able and pious, far beyond many that sate in the usual Convocations, wherein sometimes Lay-men (as Chancellors and Registers *) were admitted, as well as some members of both Houses of Parliament, in the late *Assembly*. So that if this offended them who now refused to sit in it, the offence was rather taken, then given.

And as for any fear of trouble from the Parliament, or of displeasure of his then Majesty, it was but a pannick fear, without ground. For, being called by the Parliament, the Parliament was bound to protect them. Yea, had they not been so chosen, yet if they had continued sober, quiet and peaceable, they needed not to have feared the Parliament. Witness that quiet, sober, prudent Dr. *Juckson*, Bishop of *London*, who lived quietly, and without all danger of violence or imprisonment, in the Parliament-Quarters; yet was he a man known to be firm to the King, in the greatest divisions and differences between the King and Parliament: so might all these have done, carrying themselves as he did.

And,

And, as for the Kings displeasure, there could be as little fear of that. For, he never was displeased with the Bishop of *Londons* abode here; but highly respected and honoured him, to the last. It is true, he never sate in the *Assembly*, because not chosen a Member of it. Yet the *Prince Elector Palatine* sate there, without offence to his Majesty. And albeit his Majesty at first disliked the calling and sitting of that Assembly; yet afterwards, he liked and approved of what they had done, as appears by the *Message* he sent to both Houses of Parliament, *Octob.* 11. 1648. wherein (among other things) he was pleased to express himself touching the *Assembly*, thus: *As to that part of the Proposition for the calling and sitting of the Assembly of Divines, His Majesty saith, That he will by Act of Parliament confirm the calling and sitting of the said Assembly since the first of* July 1643. *And that they shall have such powers as are mentioned in the said Ordinance. And that they shall continue their meeting and sitting, and be dissolved in such manner as both Houses of Parliament shall direct.*

But enough of this second point. It is sufficient that the Doctor in the midst of all his revilings and slanders, hath acknowledged so many to concur in the true sense of the Covenant.

III. PROPOSITION.

That notwithstanding all that he hath spoken touching the true sense of the Covenant, and so great a concurrence in it, he endeavoureth to vilifie, make odious, and to destroy the Covenant it self, as his main design.

IN the entrance to his *Answers* and *Solutions*, for satisfying of *all sober and honest mens* Consciences, to take off *their shyness of all* manner of *Episcopacy*, he begins thus, pag. 6. *To prevent which sad metamorphosis* (that is, in turning Covenanters *into pillars of Apostacies*) *in City and Country, my Answer and Resolution in point of Conscience, so far as it relates to Episcopacy, is this.* But, in the Margent, he calls his Answers, *oblique.* And they are *oblique* indeed: for, he begins them, thus:

First, he boasteth, that he can *shrewdly batter the Covenant, by urging the defectiveness* and *invalidity* of it, to *bind*, either in *conscience*, or *in any other Judicatory*; because, *without the Kings consent.* Without this, it binds no more then the Vow of a *Servant*, *Son*, *Daughter* or *Wife*, could *bind* them *without, yea against the declared* consent of their *Master*, *Father* or *Husband*, *under whose protection they were*, pag. 6. Here, see his good-will in this *Battering Ram.*

To prove this, he cites in his Margent, *Numb.* 30. 2. which makes a-

gainst

gainſt him, as I ſhall after demonſtrate. Mean while, take notice, that his inſtances of *Servants* and *Sons*, is a Tale of a Tub: there is no ſuch thing. That Chapter mentions onely *Daughters (in their Fathers houſe, in their youth)* and *Wives* that are under *Husbands*, when the *Vow* is made. Nor are their *Vows* void, for want of a *declared conſent* (as he talks:) but, they are valid, if *Father* or *Husband*, *bearing* them made, *boldeth his peace*, verſ. 4. and verſ. 7. Who will truſt ſuch a falſe man, that thus dares to falſifie an expreſs Text of Scripture?

And whereas he cites in the Margent, *Num.* 30. 2. to prove the *invalidity* of Vows of *Servants*, *Sons*, *Daughters*, *Wives*, as aforeſaid; that ſecond verſe expreſly makes againſt what he here alledged it for. His intention is to prove the Covenant *invalid*, becauſe taken by *men*, without the *Royal conſent*. To prove that, he produceth this Text. But, the Text ſpeaks onely of a *Vow* made by a *man*: and tells us, that all *ſuch Vows* are *binding*. *If a MAN vow a vow unto the Lord, and ſwear an oath to bind his ſoul with a bond, he ſhall not break his word, he ſhall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.* Here is not the leaſt hint of any Exception, no not ſo much as of a *Son*, under his Father: but, all *men* that *vow*, are by God held unto it, whether the chief Governour conſent, or not: It is onely the *vow* of a *woman*, in *minority*, or *Matrimony*, which may be made void, as is manifeſt in the ſubſequent verſes; but, not in that.

As for his *Eccho*, and *retorting the Violence and Noiſe of the times*, and *the Midwifery of tumults and Armies*, upon *the Covenant*: His *further urging the Novelty and partiality of it*. Page 7. *The ſad and Tragique Effects*, which he malitiouſly imputeth to the *Covenant* it ſelf; the *bafflings* and annulling of it *by Counter and groſs Engagements, after it had ſerved as one of the great Rocks for the late Kings Shipwrack*: theſe are all ſuch notorious untruths, that nothing but impudence it ſelf raiſed to its Meridian, would dare to avouch, or own. I therefore paſs through this mire, without *anſwering* this wiſe Doctor *according to his* ſcurrilous *folly*.

But, as to his ſixth *Oblique Anſwer*, pag. 8. wherein, he ſaith, *It is very conſiderable how the Covenant (if interpreted againſt all Epiſcopacy) muſt needs grate ſore upon, and pierce to the very quick, thoſe former* lawful Oathes (where he takes it for granted that the *Covenant* is not lawful) *not onely that of Allegiance and Supremacy, and Canonical Obedience*; but, that of the *King* at his *Coronation*. And, he after adds, that there cannot be *any Superfetation of ſuch a contradictory Vow and Covenant, without apparent perjury*. I muſt here make bold to tell him, firſt, ſuppoſing the Covenant to be againſt *all Epiſcopacy*, what is that to the Oaths of *Supremacy* and *Allegiance* to his Majeſty? Can no man be true to *Kings*, but he that is for *Biſhops*? Verily, this very Doctor herein contradicts and confutes this abſurd Aſſertion, at

pag.

pag. 25. where he saith, *Doubtless the sence of the Covenant hath lately quickned many mens Consciences in the Allegiance to the King, so to bring him (as* David) *home with infinite joy and triumph.* Who acted most in re-introducing the secluded Members, in procuring a free Parliament, and in bringing home his present Majesty, (whom God bless and preserve) but *Covenanteers?* Nor is there any syllable in the Covenant contary to, but altogether consistent with, and inciting to the most vigorous performance of those two Oaths of *Supremacy* and *Allegiance.* To charge therefore the *Covenant* as *contradictory* to the former Oaths; and, as tending to *apparent perjury*, is such manifest *blasphemy* against so sacred an *Oath of God*, as cannot but be abhorred of all sober Christians.

Touching the Oath of *Canonical Obedience to Bishops:* it is true, they took upon them to impose such a tyrannical Yoke upon too many of their brethren. But, *quo jure?* and how far were such Oaths Obligatory? This was never found practised by *Apostolick* and *Primitive Bishops*; nor warranted by any Law of this Land: but onely derived from the *Canon Law*, which here is limited by our *Statute Laws*; none of which do appoint or approve any such Oath. Nor can it be expected, that if Episcopacy should be reduced to the *Primitive Institution*, such tyranny will ever be again endured. And as for that Oath, what doth it require, but obedience *in omnibus licitis & honestis*; which, our late Episcopacy least cared for? The *Laws* tye all men to things *lawful and honest.* And, if so, then the same Doctor hath furnished me with an Argument (strong enough to retort upon the Author of it) against that *Canonical Oath*, which himself urgeth against the *Covenant*, pag. 15. (inverting onely the name of the *Covenant*, into that of this *Oath:*) *They are not the bare words of the Oath of Canonical Obedience, which as Charms, can bind any mans Conscience to or against any thing; but it is the force of Truth, Reason, Justice, Religion and Duty to God and man, our selves or others, which morally and really obligeth men, either by Gods general or particular Precepts; which are as Iron and Adamantine Bands on every mans soul, to chuse good and do it, to hate evil, and eschew it, long before any of these withes or cords of mans combining or tying, are put upon them.* By which he argues the needlesness of the *Covenant*; and so do I, of the unwarranted *Oath of Canonical Obedience.* And if this Oath should be extended to obey such Bishops as *Wren*, *Peirce*, and others, in all they of late enjoyned, there is much more cause to conclude against it, then against the *Covenant* (though it should be extended to extirpation of all *Episcopacy*) in the words of this Doctor, pag. 8. *It is therein of no bond or validity, as to any good mans Conscience.* And so farewel such an *Oath.*

And touching the *Kings Oath*, there is nothing obliging him further then to preserve that Government; so far as it is agreeable to, and warranted

warranted by the holy Scripture, and *Primitive Institution*: so far he condescended at the *Isle of Wight*. And who requireth more? And yet, even this also *may be changed, by his Royal Assent to the Counsel and Desire of the two Houses of Parliament*; as this Doctor doth more then tacitely admit, pag. 18. Cannot the Legislative Power change Government by *Bishops*, as well as *abrogate* other *Laws*? This is to charge some with *perjury*, which he dareth not to name: to fright others with a scare-Crow, or man of Clouts; and, to condemn all the Churches of Christ that have laid Episcopacy aside.

His next *Quarrel* at the *Covenant*, (if it abjure all Episcopacy) is this, That it *runs us upon a great Rock, not onely of Novelty, but of Schism; and dasheth us, both in opinion and practise, against the Judgement and Custome of the Catholique Church, in all places and ages (till of latter years**) *from the Apostles days*. This he often harps upon in a Magisterial Traditionary way. But, once prove *that our abolished Episcopacy was of so antient and universal Observation*; *Et eris mihi Magnus Apollo*. Whoever will but read *the judgement* of Doctor *John Reynolds* concerning Episcopacy, expressed in a Letter to Sir *Francis Knolls*, in the year 1598. and Dr. *Ushers* Tract, called, *The Reduction of Episcopacy*, proposed in the year 1641. will soon find this mans bold Assertion to dwindle into a vapor.

*He means till *Calvin*. See his *Dendrology* in his *sighs, tears*, &c:

Pag. 10. In the eighth place, under colour of propounding the *Loyal* and Religious sense of it; he dasheth it with *unlawfulness* to be taken at all: For, when he would have men to *retire to the sober sense wherein alone it might lawfully be taken*, he addeth an Alloy; *If it had been imposed by due Authority*. This sheweth his denial of the *lawfulness* of it. And so, in stead of satisfying a scrupulous Conscience how to take the Covenant aright, he cunningly deterreth from the taking of it at all: is not this Jugling? By *due Authority*, he meaneth *Supreme Authority*, as is clear by his next *Answer*; in examining whereof, I shall endeavour to lay open the weakness and falshood of this suggestion.

Pag. 9. Ninthly, he tells you, *It were easie to level to the ground all those fair, but fallacious pretences drawn to fortifie the Covenant, from Scripture-examples, wherein the Jews sometimes solemnly renewed their Covenant with God: But, it was that express Covenant which God himself had first made with them in* Horeb *and Mount* Sinai, *punctually prescribed by God to* Moses, *and by* Moses (*as their Supreme Governour or King*) *imposed upon them. This, they sometimes renewed, after they had broken it by their Apostacy to false and strange gods. But this was not the case of the Church or people of* England, *nor was there any need of such covenanting, any more then there was any* Moses, *or* Hezekiah, *or* Josiah, *or any chief Governour commanding it.*

As the Harlot is forward to call her *Whore*, first, with whom she unjustly quarrelleth; so this Deceiver cries out upon the *fallaciousness* of the

the *Covenant*, becauſe he ſeeks fallaciouſly to take off all men from it. In this reviling of his, there are falſhoods enow. I will inſtance in ſome.

Firſt, it is falſe that there was no Covenant, but of Gods own *preſcribing*; and, ſecondly, that he preſcribed but *one*. I ſhall, for brevity, diſcover the falſhood of both theſe together. If none, but of his *preſcribing*, what meaneth that of this Doctors own quoting before, *Num.*30. 2. which was *ſpontaneous?* What, that of *Joſhua, and the Princes of the Congregation*, with the cheating *Gibeonites? Joſh.*9.15. And, what that (to omit ſundry other) *of the children of Iſrael and the children of Judah* (after the Babyloniſh Captivity) *who joyned themſelves to the Lord in a perpetual Covenant, never to be forgotten?* Jer.50. 5. Theſe were all ſeveral Covenants, of different kinds; none of them *preſcribed*, yet all of them allowed (and the breach of them puniſhed) by God. To this, may be added, what the *Univerſity of Oxford*, in their Reaſons againſt the *Covenant* by general conſent in *Convocation, June* 1.1647. Sect.2. pag.2,3. ſaith for it ſelf, that they are unſatisfied, becauſe the Covenant is *impoſed*, which is *repugnant to the nature of a Covenant; which being a contract, implyeth a voluntary mutual conſent of the Contractors.*

It is alſo falſe, that the *Covenant* on *Mount Sinai* was *impoſed* by *Moſes* (as the *Supreme Governour or King*) *on the people*. For *Moſes* was no more their *Supreme Governour or King*, then *Samuel*, to whom the people impetuouſly cryed for a *King, to judge them like all the Nations* i, when *the Lord himſelf was their King* k.

i 1 Sam.8. 5.

Nor did *Moſes*, but *God* himſelf impoſe that Covenant in *Horeb*, as their *Supreme* Governour, if *Moſes* may be believed. For he tells us, that *The Lord talked with them face to face, in the Mount, out of the midſt of the fire. Moſes*, onely *ſtood between the Lord and them, at that time, to ſhew them the word of the Lord* l.

k 1 Sam.12 12.

l Deut.5.4 5.

And albeit there was but one *Legal Covenant*, yet what was the *Circumciſion*, and the *Paſſeover*; and many moe made, or lawful to be made, (and ſundry of them to be renewed alſo; as, the *Paſſeover*, and other *Feſtivals*) by ſuch ſolemn *preſcribing?*

And whereas he *bleſſeth God* (as they that *bleſs an idol* m) that *Apoſtacy to falſe and ſtrange gods, was not the caſe of the Church or people of England*, ſo as to take riſe from thence, to enter into this *Covenant*: I deſire him to tell me, what meant the falling off of ſundry Biſhops to too much Popery both in Doctrine (witneſs all their *Arminian* Tenets, which the learned *Bannes*, and other *Dominican* Papiſts diſclaim, and confute:) and alſo in the general practice in Cathedrals, and elſewhere, the ſetting up of *Altars, Tapers, Candles*, &c. (*deviſed by mans fancies:*) which laſt (among other things) is in the *Queens Injunctions*, affirmed to *tend to Idolatry and Superſtition; which of all other*

m Eſay 66. 3.

Injunct. 3.

offences, God Almighty doth most detest and abhor, for that the same diminish most his honour and glory.

The like may be said of the late *Church-Musique*, *Anthemes*, &c. sung with so much curiosity, quavering, tautologies, &c. that the hearers cannot understand any part of the matter which is sung. A thing which not only the judicious *Hooker* censured and condemned; but the late Queen *Elizabeth* provided against, *Injunct.* 49. by enjoyning only modest and distinct *songs to be so used in all parts of the Common-prayers in the Church, that it may be as plainly understood, as if it were read without singing.* And even where *Musick, at the beginning, or ending of Common-prayer*, was *permitted*, it was further provided, that if an *Hymn* were *sung*, care should be taken that it might be so done, as to be *understood and perceived.* And where this is not so done, see the censure of the *Homily* of the *place and time of Prayer*, part 2. where such *chaunting and playing upon Organs*, are said to have *displeased God so sore, and filthily defiled his holy House, and his place of Prayer, that for it he justly destroyed many Nations.*

To say nothing of the many thousands of *Popish* families in *England*, and the swarms of *Priests*, *Jesuites* and other Emissaries of the *Pope*, that at all times creep in, not only into Widows houses, but into Noble-mens and Princes Houses, to seduce, and draw more and more men and women off from the truth to Superstition and Idolatry every day. There is therefore cause enough to make such a *Covenant.* But, where he addeth, That this *Covenant* was but *the petty composition of a few Politique men, very* mean Subjects *some of them, either as* Lawyers, *or* Ministers, *a great part of whom, he, and others knew to be no very great Clerks or States-men; and fitter for a* Country Cure, *then to contrive and compose Solemn Leagues and Covenants*, &c. adding, that *their heads, rather then their hearts, and their State-correspondencies more then their Consciences, brought forth this Covenant.* I shall not retort, that there be not none who know him to be such an one himself: but only, desire all, to pity and pray for him. This railing vein is so incorporated into his proud felleous heart, that there is no hope of curing it, but by slighting such palpable scornings, and praying for the *scorner*, that the Lord may either heal, or *rebuke* him (*n*).

Pag. 11.

(*n*) Zech. 3. 2.

Lastly, He confidently (I will not say, not for want of ignorance) avoucheth, that *there is no* precept *or* patern *for any such in all the* New Testament, *nor in all succeeding ages*; and that *we never read, nor heard of any Covenanting Christians (until the Holy League* (meaning that of bloudy Papists to destroy the *Hugonotes*, as they termed the Protestants) *in France)* except that of *Baptism* —— *this is the New and Evangelical Covenant of all true Christians: this* (he saith) *we break by wilful and presumptuous sins; and renew by true repentance and worthy participation of the Lords Supper.* Then he proceeds, saying; *How vastly*

vastly different from this sacred Covenant, this late piece of Policy more then Piety is, &c. *he leaves to all sober minded Christians to judge.* Pag. 12.

To which I answer, That if there were no *precept*, nor *patern* in the *New Testament*, it is sufficient if there be any in the *Old*; if not *Levitical*, or meerly *Typical*: unless this Doctor be turned *Antinomian*. For, *all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness*, 2 Tim. 3. 16. This is meant of the *Old*, as well as *New Testament*. *For, whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope*, Rom. 15. 4.

2. What meaneth he by this *Covenant?* Is it his meaning, that there is no precept nor patern for Covenanting against our *English Episcopacy?* (there is not any for it, say I.) Nor is it much material, that he hath found none against it, for we can find no such *Episcopacy* in the New Testament; nor, warranted by it; notwithstanding all his common talk in this Book, and elsewhere. But this Gentleman must be pleased to look upon this Covenant, not only as against his adored Episcopacy, but in the full Latitude, as being extended *against Popery, Heresie, Schisme, Prophaness, and whatsoever is contrary to sound Doctrine and the power of godliness* in our selves as well as others: And, for the *Preservation* and *Reformation* of Religion against the Common Enemies, as likewise *to preserve and defend the Kings Majesties person and Authority, to discover all Incendiaries, Hinderers of the Reformation of Religion* (beware, Doctor) *Dividers between the King and his People, or one of the Kingdoms from the other*; to endeavour the *continuance* of the happy *Union and Peace* between them; *to assist and defend all that have taken it, in the maintaining and pursuance thereof*; to be *unfainedly humbled for our own sins, and for the sins of these Kingdoms*, and to *endeavour for our selves and all others under our charge, in all duties to God and man, to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real Reformation.* This is the sum of that *Covenant* (which each man promiseth to observe, *in and according to their several places and callings only*) that this man so much setteth at naught, spurneth at, and does what he can to cause all men to throw off and abominate, meerly upon that one single clause of *extirpating the late Hierarchy*, if so intended, as, for the future, to keep out all such Episcopacy as he would have to be retroduced, although he never particularly describeth, nor setteth forth what that is.

And now, *I might leave it to all sober Christians to judge*, whether this *Covenant (taken in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as all that take it shall answer at that great day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed,)* be a *piece of Policy more then of Piety*; And how little it differs from

that *sacred Covenant* of *Baptism*, wherein every man *stipulateth*, and Covenanteth to *deny all ungodliness and wordly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world* (o)?

o Tit. 2. 12.

What other in effect and substance is our present solemn League and Covenant? And dares this Seraphical *Doctor* to say, that this could not be *lawfully taken*, for want of *due Authority to impose* it? doth not God require as much? hath not he imposed all these things upon all Christians? are not they all called upon by God himself to *Vow* all these unto *God*, and *to pay them* too? What then can it be less then desperate madness, to throw off such a Covenant?

And is there *no precept or patern* to warrant such a *Covenant* in the *New testament?* what is the meaning of that, spoken to men under the *Baptismal-covenant* before; *Give your selves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead?* Rom. 6. 13. What is it to *contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the Saints* (p), *in nothing terrified by the adversaries* (q)? Are not these *precepts* (together with that in *Tit.* 2. 12. before mentioned) warrant enough to Vow and Covenant, again and again, to do all this? And as for *Paterns*, what saith our Doctor to that of the *Macedonians*, namely, their *giving themselves first to the Lord*; and then, unto *Paul, by the will of God* (r)? Nay, what saith he to *Paul* himself, joyning with *those four men that had a vow upon them* s; *whom Paul* (by advice *of James and all the Elders that were present* (t) took, *and the next day purifying himself with them, entred into the Temple, to signifie the accomplishment of the days of purification* (u)? If it be said this was a *Ceremonial Covenant:* I reply, If *Paul* himself held it lawful (even when *those vows* were to be at an end) for avoiding of scandal among weak brethren, or malicious persecuting Jews, to enter such a Vow (which he had upon him after his conversion, *Acts* 18. 10.) without any imposition of God or man, even under the Gospel: then much more would he allow such a *Covenant* as this, being altogether *Evangelical.*

p Jude 3.
q Phil. 1. 28
r 2 Cor. 8. 5
s Act. 21. 23
t Vers. 18
u Vers. 26.

But whereas he will allow but one *Covenant*, to wit, *Baptism*, in the Gospel; and this being *broken by wilful and presumptuous sins, is renewed by true repentance, and worthy participation of the Lords Supper:* there are in this almost as many gross errors, as words.

For, first, Is not the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper*, a Gospel-Covenant, as well as *Baptism?* Did ever any intelligent Divine either deny this, or affirm it to be a *renewing* of the other, and not a *Covenant* in it self? Secondly, Do true Christians, truly entred into the *Baptismal Covenant*, break it by *wilful and presumptuous sins?* I had thought that *he that is born of God*, doth *not* (so) *sin*, for that *his seed remaineth in him:* yea, *that he cannot* (so) sin, *because he is born of God* w: and that, though he *doth what he hateth*; yet, *not allowing* it, nor *wilfully and presumptuously*, but out *of weakness, (being led into captivity)* doing what

w 1 Joh. 3. 9.

what he would not, it is no more he that doth it, but sin that dwelleth in him x. Thirdly, Doth *Repentance* take off *wilful and presumptuous sins?* In the Law there was no *Sacrifice* appointed for such sins: yea, God made a Law, that *he that sinned presumptuously, should die the death* y. And in the Gospel, if we believe the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, we are taught, that *if we sin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice* (no not of Christ himself) *for sin, but a fearful looking for of judgement, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries* z. Fourthly, Doth *Repentance renew* our *Covenant* made in *Baptism?* Surely, no more then it reneweth *the remission of our sins:* which, not *Repentance*, but Christ, in *Baptism*, bestoweth upon us once for all *a*: *For he, by one offering, hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified* b. Repentance recovereth the sense of Gods favour and pardon, but doth not give a new remission. Again, fifthly, *The Lords Supper* doth not renew our Baptismal Covenant as to *remission of sin*, but strengthneth us, on Christs part, to perform our Covenant in Baptism; and reneweth our Vows on our part, to perform it better: therefore it is called, *The Communion of the body and blood of Christ, whereby, we being many, are made one bread, and one body, because we are thereby partakers of that one bread* c; *of which he that eateth, shall live for ever* d. By this means, *We grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ* e. Sixthly, *The Lords Supper* is not to be renewed, or taken again and again, for renewing our *Baptismal Covenant*, because broken by *wilful and presumptuous sins*; but, for the renewing of our thankful remembrance of his death *f*; for our more full *Communion with him, by partaking of him* g, and *encrease in him, till we come to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ* h.

x Rom. 7. 16, 17.
y
z Heb. 10. 26, 27.
a Act. 2. 38.
b Heb. 10. 14.
c 1 Cor. 10 16, 17.
d Joh. 6. 51
e Ephes. 4. 15.
f 1 Cor 11. 26.
g 1 Cor. 10
h Ephes. 4. 14.

I have insisted on this the longer, because these few words savour strongly of *Arminianism*, and *Popery*. I shall make amends by *brevity* in the rest. Whereas he tells us, pag. 13. that *there is neither Law of God or man, requiring, imposing or comprobating any such Covenant*; and that *it appears at best, to be but a matter of Will-Worship of humane and private invention, void of publick and plenary injunction, esteemed by many to be but as a stratagem of State, a flag of Faction, an Engine framed on purpose to batter down Episcopacy, and to seize their Estates, and all the Patrimony of the Church, to the great enriching of some Sacrilegious Protestants*, &c. and, *to the great joy of the Romish Party and Jesuites*, &c. *who are thought by many wise men to have been, if not the* Sires, *yet the* Sibs *to that Covenant*. This, and much more, is so full of railing, that no wise man will hold it other then folly to bestow a Line in Answer to it. If this be not *Blasphemy*, I know not what is. As for his frequent prating of *Sacrilege*, here, in his *Sermons*, in his long, tedious Ink-

Ink-horn, *Tears*, *Sighs*, &c. I know none ſo like unto *Doeg*, as this falſe vain-glorious man, whoſe *tongue* (and pen) *deviſe miſchief, like a ſharp Raſor, working deceitfully: loving evil more then good, and lying rather then to ſpeak righteouſneſs.* For this point, I again refer him to Doctor *Burges*, whoſe Book making it out that it is *no Sacrilege nor Sin to buy ſuch Lands*, ſtill lies unanſwered: and yet men go on with their clamours and railings, as if nothing had been offered to ſtop their mouths who can ſwallow Church Lands formerly alienated, without the leaſt regret.

But whereas he ſaith, pag. 24. *This Age is the firſt Parent of this Prodigie, wherein Orthodox and reformed Chriſtians, either Presbyters or People, did perſecute godly Biſhops (of the ſame Faith and Profeſſion) yea, and Epiſcopacy it ſelf, though never ſo regular and reformed:* I muſt crave leave to ſay, That however *Godly Biſhops* have heretofore been perſecuted unto death, in divers former ages of the Church; yet neither were they perſecuted *by Orthodox and reformed Chriſtians*, but by enemies to the *Truth* and *Godlineſs*. Nor did any *Orthodox and reformed Chriſtians, either Presbyters or People, perſecute any godly Biſhops of this age.* This therefore is a mere calumny and ſlander. It is true, that ſome *Orthodox and reformed Chriſtians*, did exhibit and proſecute Archbiſhop *Laud*, Biſhop *Wren*, and Biſhop *Peirce*, two (if not all of them) being charged with no leſs than *High Treaſon:* the firſt whereof being found guilty, was executed *Jan.* 10. 1644. The other two never anſwered the Articles exhibited againſt them unto this day, nor vindicated themſelves of thoſe Aſperſions caſt upon them, for being the prime and moſt active, and officious Inſtruments of *Laud*, to ſet the Church on fire; by means whereof, all the reſt of the Biſhops ſped the worſe.

How *godly* theſe were, I know not; but this Doctor hath been the Proctor, and Advocate of *Laud* k, and Doctor *Wren* l, highly applauding them in oppoſition to the charge of the Houſe of Commons againſt them: and that he might lick clean him that was a known *Papiſt*, (his hand being in) he beſtows a Vindication or Apologie, even for the late Biſhop of *Gloceſter*, Doctor *Goodman* m alſo; only he could find nothing to ſay for Biſhop *Peirce*, though he ſo devoutly *thanked God that he had put down all the Lectures in his Diocеſs.*

k *Sighs*, &c. pag. 628.
l pag. 634.
m pag. 637

There were, no doubt, ſome of thoſe Biſhops which he alſo commendeth, that were learned and pious. But let him name one of thoſe (unleſs ſuch as were trapann'd by *Williams*, and other Capritious Pragmaticks, to have their hands in that high and unparliamentary *Petition and Proteſtation to the late King and Houſe of Peers*, in Dec. 1641.) that were ever in the leaſt perſecuted, and not rather honoured (if learned and indeed godly) by *Orthodox and reformed Chriſtians*, whether *Presbyters* or *People*. If any of them ſuffered with the reſt, in the

aboliſhing

aboliſhing of ſuch *Prelacy*, they may thank thoſe other ruffling, Ceremonious, violent Ringleaders before named; and not blame others who could not help it, nor longer endure the ſlavery and perſecution which thoſe *Amaziah-like Prieſts* (n), and Tyrants, had exerciſed over them. I now proceed to my laſt *Propoſition*, which is this.

n Amos.

IIII. PROPOSITION.

That, maugre all this mans calumnies, and malicious aſperſions, the Covenant, (even as to the point of that Hierarchical Epiſcopacy lately laid aſide,) is to be conſtantly and conſciencioufly obſerved and kept, in the right ſenſe thereof, by all that have taken it, as they will avoid deſtruction here, and damnation hereafter.

DVrus ſermo, you will ſay: *this is an hard ſaying.* But, not more *hard* then *true*. I ſhall make it out, thus.

1. If it were a Covenant made between man and man, God will require performance, or ſeverely puniſh the breach of it. We ſee this in the breach of the Covenant made by *Joſhua* and the *Princes of Iſrael*: *Joſh.* 9. 15. Although they obtained it by a wile, and by a lye. By a *wile*, in coming in *old ſhooes and clouted, and old garments upon them, and all the bread of their proviſion, was dry and mouldy*, ver. 5. By *a lye*, ſeveral times repeated, in ſaying, they *came from a far*; yea, *a very far country*, verſ. 6. &c. whereas after the Covenant made, their *lying* appeared, and they were diſcovered, *at the end of three days*, to be *their neighbours, and that they dwelt among them.* All the Congregation of Iſrael, would hereupon have ſmitten and deſtroyed them, they being ſuch as by Gods command were to have been deſtroyed by *Joſhua* (o), and had now ſo baſely cheated *Joſhua*, and all Iſrael. This the Princes would not ſuffer; whereupon all *the Congregation murmured againſt the Princes: But all the Princes ſaid to all the Congregation, We have ſworn unto them by the Lord God of Iſrael; now therefore we may not touch them*, ver. 18, 19. This quieted the people for the preſent, and for a long time after. Howbeit *Saul*, in an humor of envy or malice, many hundred years after *ſlew the Gibeonites*, which then he found in Iſrael. But Gods anger was ſo kindled at this, that he ſmote all the Land with a *famine*, for *three years* together, even towards the latter end of *Davids* reign. And when *David enquired of the Lord*, the cauſe of this ſore Plague, *The Lord anſwered, It is for Saul, and his bloudy houſe, becauſe he ſlew the Gibeonites*, 2 Sam. 21. 1. To appeaſe this wrath, *ſeven* of *Sauls* ſons, were demanded, and *hanged before the Lord*, ver. 9. —— *And after that, the Lord was entreated for the Land*, ver. 14.

o Verſ. 24.

Now,

Now, if God were ſo ſevere for the breach of ſuch a deceitfully obtained Covenant between man and man, when they that procured it, were ſo baſe and falſe as our Doctor would make the late *Covenant* contrivers, and deſtined to deſtruction by God himſelf by that very hand which made that League with them: How ſinful and dangerous muſt it needs be, for men, upon any pretence whatſoever, to depart from, or wilfully to break any Covenant made with God himſelf! Here was no preſcribing of the *League* by God, nor *force* upon *Joſhua* or *Iſrael:* Yet God would not put up the breach of it, even upon the poſterity of a treacherous Crew that had meerly cheated all his people at once.

2. There is no Covenant made between man and man, but it is the *Oath* of God, and *his Covenant.* So, that Oath and Covenant made between the King and his Subjects, is called, *The Oath of God,* Eccleſ.8.2. thus the Oath and Covenant of *Zedekiah,* made with the *King of Babylon,* (an Idolater, and an enemy of God and all his people) is by God himſelf called, *Mine Oath, and my Covenant,* Ezek.17.19. And upon this account it was, that *Joſhua* and the Princes of Iſrael, ſwearing *by the Name of the Lord God,* they durſt not to touch the *Gibeonites.* Therefore all ſuch Covenants are irrevocable, and indiſpenſable. If any man ſhall break them, he is ſure to be ruined. Witneſs *Zedekiah,* though a *King,* and though forced by the *King of Babylon,* who had conquered *Judah,* laid aſide the rightful King thereof, *Jehojakim,* and ſet up *Mattaniah* (Uncle to *Jehojahim*) whom he called *Zedekiah* q, and *made him ſwear by God,* to be a Tributary to him; yet, *rebelled againſt him,* 2 Chron.36.13. His rebellion was, his *ſending Ambaſſadours into Egypt, that they might give him Horſes, and much people,* to arm himſelf to throw off the yoke of the King of *Babylon* to whom he had ſworn to be ſubject, *Ezek.*17.15. Now, much might have been ſaid for this. That *Nebuchadnezzar* was an enemy, a great Tyrant over the people of God, who were *Abrahams* ſeed, and that were not to be *in bondage to any man.* And the *Covenant* was impoſed on him by force, *&c.*

q 2 Kin.24.17.

But, all this notwithſtanding, mark how God takes this breach of ſuch a forc'd Covenant as this: *Shall he break the Covenant, and be delivered?* Nay, now he that cared not for his Oath, makes God himſelf to ſwear his ruine: *As I live, ſaith the Lord God, ſurely in the place where the King dwelleth, that made him King, whoſe Oath he deſpiſed, and whoſe Covenant he brake, even with him, in the midſt of Babylon he ſhall die. Neither ſhall Pharaoh with his mighty Army, and great company, make for him in the war, by caſting up mounts, and building forts to cut off many perſons. Seeing he deſpiſed the Oath by breaking the Covenant, (when lo, he had given his hand) and hath done all theſe things, he ſhall not eſcape. Therefore thus ſaith the Lord God,* (again) *As I live,*

ſurely

surely mine Oath that he hath despised, and my Covenant that he hath broken, even it I will recompence upon his own head. And I will spread my net upon him, and he shall be taken in my snare, and I will bring him to Babylon, and will plead with him there for his trespass that he hath trespassed against ME. And all his fugitives (such as first counselled him to break that Covenant) *and all his bands* (that adhered to him in that war) *shall fall by the Sword; and they that remain, shall be scattered abroad towards all winds. And ye shall know that I the Lord have spoken it:* Vers. 16.17,18,19,20,21.

By this it is clear as the Sun, that God will never put up the wilful breach of any *Covenant*, but dreadfully punish it, even upon Kings themselves; and will extend his wrath not onely upon themselves, but upon all that counsel them to it, (Take heed, Doctor) and joyn with them in it. *Of how much sorer punishment then suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy*, who shall dare to trample under feet any Covenant made with God himself, in what manner soever, *as an unholy thing?*

Nor will this end with temporal plagues in this life; but in *Hell* hereafter, although the *Vow* and *Oath* were but *voluntary*, and not *imposed*. For the breach of such an Oath, Vow, or Covenant, is a sin; and *the wages of sin is death* r; not onely natural, but *eternal*, if not repented of. That this is *a sin*, appears plainly by Gods own Declaration, *Deut.* 23. 21. *When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee, and it would be sin in thee*; to wit, *not to pay it*; yea, to be *slack to pay it*. And that this is meant of even *a voluntary vow*, appears in vers. 22. *But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee.* Wherefore, he addeth, vers. 23. *That which is gone out of thy lips, thou shalt keep and perform; even a free-will offering, according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, which thou hast promised with thy mouth.* Can there be a clearer proof?

r Rom. 6.23

Take one more, that *by two or three witnesses, every word may be established.* It is that of the *Preacher*, Eccles. 5. 4, 5. *When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no pleasure in fools*, (which, with God, are *wicked men*, Psalm 73. 3.) *Pay that which thou hast vowed. Better is it that thou shouldest not vow, then that thou shouldst vow, and not pay.* This therefore makes it out, that it is *a sin* not to perform a voluntary vow. Now, lest, after a vow, the *Covenanter* should not think to evade his vow, by pleading, that he did it rashly, and it was an errour in him so to do; it is added, by way of *anticipation*, vers. 6. *Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin, neither say thou before the Angel, that it was an errour. Wherefore should God be angry at thy voice*, (that is, wherefore shouldst thou anger him by so speaking?) *and destroy the work of thy hands?* It being now plain that this is a sin, it cannot be denyed, that a wilful continued breach of a *volun-*

tary Vow and Covenant, if not duely repented of, will certainly *end in Hell.*

If it be ſaid, Theſe inſtances are of particular and private perſons: what is this, to prove the like *ſinfulneſs* and *danger* of the breach, or throwing off of a *National Oath, League, and Covenant*, not impoſed by *due*, or *Supreme Authority?*

To this I Anſwer:

1. The *Obligation* of an Oath or Covenant, conſiſteth not in the paucity or multitude of thoſe that enter into it, but in the making uſe of God in it; and his declaration thereupon. This was a tye upon all *Iſrael*; the *ſwearing* to the perfidious *Gibeonites, by the Lord God of Iſrael*, as we have ſhewed before. Hence that of *Solomon*, Eccleſ. 8. 2. *I counſel thee to keep the Kings commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God.* Where this comes, the Oath and Covenant is indiſſolubly binding. If we once *lift up our hand to the moſt high God*, he will be ſure to lift up his hand againſt us, if we *Vow*, and *not pay*; be we few, or many.

2. Nor will the impoſing, or not impoſing of it by Supreme Authority alter the Caſe. For, it is obſervable, that in all ſuch National Vows and Covenants, neither the *Supreme* Magiſtrates *impoſition*, or ſo much as conſent, is at all recorded in Scripture, or mentioned: which ſhews that there is no neceſſity of either. It is *God*, not *Kings*, that makes the Covenant obligatory. Take an inſtance or two.

The one is of *all Iſrael*, in the Wilderneſs. When they were ſet upon by *King Arad the Canaanite*, who (at firſt worſted them) *and took ſome of them priſoners*; *Iſrael vowed a vow to the Lord, and ſaid, If thou wilt indeed deliver this people into my hand, then I will utterly deſtroy* sNum 21. 2 *their Cities* s. Here is no word, or hint of *Moſes* (their *Supreme Governour*, as this Doctor unadviſedly calls him:) yet the *Vow and Covenant* was binding. For God took notice of it, and by his acting confirmed it. *The Lord hearkened to the voice of Iſrael, and delivered up the Canaanites, and they utterly deſtroyed them, and their Cities* ver. 3.

The other is of *Judah*, and part of *Iſrael* (many hundred years after) in the days of *Aſa*; who being by him *gathered together at Hieruſalem*, to make an offering to the Lord, *they entred into a Covenant to ſeek the Lord God of their fathers, with all their heart, and with all their ſoul, That whoſoever would not ſeek the Lord God of Iſrael, ſhould be put to death, whether ſmall or great, whether man or woman; and they ſwore unto the Lord with a loud voice.——And all Judah rejoyced at the oath,——and he was found of them, and the Lord gave them reſt round about*, 2 Chron. 15. 12, 13, &c. Here was a National Covenant, and a Divine acceptance of it. Yet no word, or ſyllable of *Aſa*, as

impoſing,

impoſing, or *confirming* of it. Which is evidence enough, that the *impoſing*, or *conſenting* of a King, is not of the eſſence of a Legitimate Covenant: It is enough that God owns it, and commands performance. Nor can any one inſtance be given, throughout the whole Book of God, that any *Oath*, *Vow*, or *Covenant*, to which the King, or Supreme Magiſtrate, would not, or did not *conſent*, was upon that reaſon or groud made null and void: or, that any King ever went about to vacate, and adnul any Covenant made with God without the *conſent* of the *King*. It is then no other but blaſpheming the *Gods*, to term the late Parliament *bungling Reformers*, for *doing Church-work without the Maſter-builders, Kings and Biſhops*; if he refer it to the *Covenant*. If he doth not ſo, then this is but a piece of railing *Non-ſenſe*, pull'd in by head and ears, to vent his gaul upon his betters.

Do not all Parliaments adviſe and conſult with whom they think meet, even in matters of Religion and Eccleſiaſtical affairs as well as Civil, and Vote and paſs them before they offer them to the King? did they not ſo, in this? And did not his then Majeſty take them into conſideration, and condeſcend to ſo much, as they gave him time to conſider of? without declaring againſt the reſt, but only ſuſpending *conſent*, till his Conſcience might be better ſatisfied?

Nay, even that which was never offered to his Majeſty at all, (being no way contrary or contradictory to the *Oaths* of *Supremacy*, and *Allegiance*) was never oppoſed, or contradicted by him. Witneſs the *Proteſtation* of *May* 5. 1641. taken by both Houſes of Parliament: and afterwards, by the *Houſe of Commons* alone, impoſed on all the Kingdom, without ſo much as asking his Majeſties *conſent*: which was never controuled, or diſallowed by the King, albeit he was then in Perſon reſiding at *White-hall*, and could not be ignorant of what was done therein.

And, what ails the man to make ſuch a noiſe about the *impoſing* of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, without the then King, who was then abſent! Did not both *Ezra*, and *Nehemiah* alſo draw all the people into a ſolemn *Covenant* with God *t*, without ſpecial Commiſſions (unleſs for reparing the *Temple*) from the *Perſian* Monarch, then their Soveraign; albeit they were not free Subjects, but *Vaſſals*, and one of them the menial ſervant of *Artaxerxes*, then by Conqueſt Supreme Governour of *Judah*? *t* Ezra. 10. 3 Neh. 9. 38.

Nor did his late Majeſty ever command the renouncing of the ſaid *Solemn League and Covenant* taken by both Kingdoms, *Sept.* 11. 1643. albeit he publiſhed a *Proclamation*, *Jun.* 21. in the 19th year of his Reign, *viz.* *An.* 1643. againſt that other *Vow and Covenant*, which was about that time, taken by the *Lords and Commons*, and by them appointed to be *taken by every man in the Cities of* London, Weſtmin-

ster, *and the Suburbs thereof, and throughout the whole Kingdom:* the administring and taking of which (by such as had not taken it) were by that Proclamation, for the reasons therein contained, forbidden.

But, albeit this were lately (by an enemy to the other Solemn League and Covenant) without warrant, reprinted, and scattered up and down as if it had been an interdicting and prohibiting those that had taken it, to perform it; and to give some countenance to that railing Pamphlet of the Doctor here laid open in his colours; in hope that Ignorant ones would surely thereupon cast off that Covenant of God: yet that was but a meer cheat and gullery, of which it behoves all honest men and sober Christians to take notice, and beware.

Nor are Oaths and Covenants once solemnly taken, to be cast off and disclaimed upon any pretence whatsoever, be there never so many defects and failings in the imposing or taking of them, unless the matter of them be sinful, as that of those *Jews* that *bound themselves under an Oath of Execration*, or *curse*, *not to eat or drink till they had killed* u Act. 23. 14 *Paul* u. This I have said enough unto already; yet do repeat it, because since the writing of the premises, I have met with a Book intituled, *The Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance which have been laid a-*
w Pag. 5. *side for many years*, &c. which tells us w, That *though there be many infirmities and miscarriages committed in the making and taking of publique Oaths; and although the things they oblige unto, be against the interest of the people; and though the breach and violation thereof, hath the countenance of fair and specious intents and ends, seemingly conducing unto the publique good of the people; yet neither all nor any of these pretentions, doth either make void the obligations of those Oaths, nor deliver the people from the great guilt of the sin which is committed in the violation thereof, nor secure them from the dreadful judgement of God.* Who is the Author hereof, I know not; but I am confident that the Doctor and he aim both at one mark: which makes me to alledge him.

It is true, there is another Book lately reprinted, bearing this Title; *Reasons of the present Judgement of the University of Oxford* concerning *the Solemn League and Covenant*, &c. *approved by general consent in a full Convocation*, June 1. 1647. in which Book many Reasons are alledged why those who were then *Masters*, *Scholars*, *Officers*, *and other Members of that University*, could not take that *Covenant*, and another *Negative Oath*. But that no way concerneth the present Case; for their *Reasons* tend only to *their own justification* for their *not taking* of the *Covenant and Oath* then tendred to them, not, to fall upon others who had already taken it. Therefore there is no need to add any Answers thereunto, although he that caused it to be *reprinted*, pretendeth to do it, *for the satisfaction of others*; which cannot in any sense, reach those who have taken the *Covenant* already.

And

And now, good Mr. Doctor, think more seriously in cold blood, of your high presumption, in casting so much dirt upon that *Covenant* which his present gracious Majesty hath so highly honoured; of which, perhaps, you may one day be required to render an account, if men have any zeal for his Majesties honour. I forbear Particulars, in this: but you may do well to lay to heart particularly, what becomes you herein.

Nor hath this Kingdom onely entered into a Solemn League and Covenant themselves: but, they have approved, even in Parliament, what others have done in like cases abroad. When the Kingdom of *Scotland* (even without their King) entred into a *Solemn League and Covenant* among themselves, (before their joyning with *England* in this) and were threatned to be chastised, for that, and other things, by a puissant Army; yet afterwards, upon a through debate thereof in the Parliament of *England*, it was declared by King and Parliament, That *our Brethren of* Scotland *had done nothing but what became Loyal and obedient Subjects; and were thereupon, by Act of Parliament, publickly righted in all the Churches of this Kingdom, where they had been defamed.*

Yea, the same *Exhortation* (out of which the precedent Paragraph is extracted) telleth us, That neither this *Doctrine* nor *Practise* hath been (formerly) *deemed seditious, or unwarrantable by the* (former) *Princes that have sate upon the* (English) *Throne, but justified and defended by Queen* Elizabeth *of blessed memory, with the expence of much Treasure and Noble Blood, in the united Provinces of the* Netherlands, *combined, not onely without, but against the unjust violence of* Philip (the second) *of* Spain (first and chiefly in matters of Religion) *King* James (of like blessed memory) *followed her steps, so far as to approve their union, and to enter into League with them* as free States; *which was after continued by his last Majesty, who both by his Expedition for relief of* Rochel *in* France, *and by his strict confederacy* (and Allyance) *with the the late Prince of* Orange, *notwithstanding all the importunity of* Spain *to the contrary, did set to his seal, That all that had been done by his Royal Ancestors, in maintenance of those who had so engaged and combined themselves, was just and warrantable.*

See the *Exhortation* for taking the Covenant, ordered by the *House of Commons* to be printed, *Feb.* 9. 1643.

Thus, Mr. Doctor, I have given you some *patterns* of Covenanting Christians, beside the *Holy League* in *France*, the two Houses of Parliament (whom you take pleasure, every where to bespatter, as if they were Fools and Rebels) in *England*, and our Brethren in *Scotland*. I forbear to mention *Germany*, the *Cantons*, the *Albigenses*, and others, because I have said enough already to shew the fowlness of your Pen, and the falshood of him that held it, in saying, there is *no pattern* of such a Covenant in *any ages of the Church*, *and that we never read nor heard of any* Covenanting *Christians* (until the Ligue Sainte in *France*)

except

except thoſe who in Baptiſm were ſprinkled with the blood of Chriſt, and ſo entred into that Covenant, &c. pag. 11.

I have now taken my walk through your gaudy Field: but have gathered little fruit. I therefore forbear further progreſs; unleſs to take a view of Her whom you call *Your dear Mother the Church of* England, pag. 5. I pray, who, and what is She? Which Queſtion I ask not, as if I were of opinion that there is none ſuch: but, to know of you whom you take Her to be. I have read of one *Mother of us all* x. I know no more *Mothers*, although I know more Churches. I have read in the *Articles of Religion*, eſtabliſhed in 13 *Eliz.* cap. 12. y That *the viſible Church of Chriſt is a Congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly adminiſtred, according to Chriſts Ordinance, in all thoſe things that of neceſſity are requiſite to the ſame.*

x Gal. 4. 26.

y Art. 19.

But, you are *not ſo rude an Underſtander, nor ſo uncritical a Speaker. By the Church of* England, *you plainly and charitably mean that part of mankind in this* Polity *or* Nation *which having been called, baptiſed, and inſtructed, by lawful Miniſters in the Myſteries and Duties of the Goſpel, maketh a joynt and publick Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, and Reformed Religion, in the name, and as the ſenſe of the whole Nation*, &c. Thus you, in your *Tears, Sighs*, &c. *of the Church of* England, pag. 24. Then, all *man-kind* in this *Polity* and *Nation*, making ſuch a *Profeſſion*, is your *Dear Mother*. Are not you then, *Terræ Filius*, Sir? St. *Paul* tells us, *Hieruſalem which is above, is the Mother of us all*. But you tell us, Your *Mother* is (not *Hieruſalem*, ut) *England*, which is below, and not free. Much joy may you have of her. I can own her as a *Church*, but not as a *Mother*. I have read of no *Mothers* in the New Teſtament, in relation to *Churches*, but onely *Hieruſalem* (not Earthly, but Cœleſtial:) and *Babylon*, *the great Whore, the Mother of Harlots* z. If the Doctor have found out a third, much good may ſhe do him. Now I ſee what makes him ſo excentrick and extravagant: namely, his ſucking too much of his *Mothers Milk*, when ſhe had eaten too much poyſonous meat of *Arminianiſm*, *Socinianiſm*, and *Popery*.

z Rev. 17. 18.

And now, Sir, I ſhall for this time take my leave of you, with this cloſe: that whereas you (pag. 25.) vant, that, *in two days you finiſhed thoſe Anſwers and Solutions*; truly, Sir, I think ſo too: and do believe, that whoever ſhall carefully compare thoſe *Anſwers* and *Solutions* with this *Reply*, (which coſt more time) will be of the ſame opinion: and, that the ſpirit of perverſneſs, pride, and time-ſerving ambition, did dictate them unto you.

Poſt-ſcript.

POST-SCRIPT.

I *Had almoſt forgotten your high Commendation of* Dr. Uſhers *Model of reformed Epiſcopacy, in his* Reduction: *which, for my part, I diſlike not. Only I muſt take occaſion hence to tell you; or rather others, that ſince the reprinting of that* Reduction *of* Epiſcopacy *into the form of a* Synodical Government (*which little Piece was truly* Dr. *Uſhers child*) *there hath a Baſtard appear'd, which is called,* The Biſhop of Armagh's Direction concerning the Liturgy, and Epiſcopal Government, *ſaid to be written* at the request of the Houſe of Commons, *in the year* 1642. *Which is a meer fiction, and a lye. For ſo Dr.* Bernard *in his Book intituled,* The judgement of the Archbiſhop of Armagh, *&c. aſſureth us, pag.* 160, *That in* An. 1640. *There was a Book printed, intituled* The Biſhop of Armaghs judgment to the Houſe of Parliament, concerning the Liturgy, and Epiſcopal Government. *And in* An. 1641. *another Book intituled* Vox Hibernia, *being ſome pretended Notes of his at a Publique Faſt. Both theſe at his Petition, were ſuppreſſed by* Order from the Houſe of Lords and Commons, Feb. 11. 1641. *And now revived, to thruſt out the other, which is his Legitimate iſſue.*

FINIS.